

**These minutes are a summary of the discussion. The audible recording is available at the following website: <http://bit.ly/T3S7CB>**

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting  
Minutes of November 7, 2012  
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall

**Present:** Chairman Nathaniel Cannady, Vice-Chairman Jeremy Goldstein, Kristy Carter, Jane Gianvito Mathews, Joe Minicozzi, Holly P. Shriner and Paul Smith

**Absent:** None

**Pre-Meeting - 4:30 p.m.**

The Commission discussed the items on the agenda, and was given a summary review of potential upcoming agenda items. They were updated by the staff regarding zoning projects that are not approved by the Commission.

**Regular Meeting - 5:00 p.m.**

Chairman Cannady called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and informed the audience of the public hearing process.

**Administrative**

- ? Mr. Smith initiated a brief discussion on whether the minutes should be verbatim or only what is legally required (motions only) because he was concerned that if comments are left out, it distorts the conversation in some cases. It was the consensus of the Committee to continue with the summary minutes with a caveat at the beginning of the minutes stating that the minutes are a summary of the discussion and the audible recording is available at the following website: <http://bit.ly/T3S7CB>
- ? Ms. Mathews moved to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2012, meeting, with non-substantial changes. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.
- ? Chairman Cannady announced that the application for a conditional zoning request for the project identified as Leasing and Equipment Sales Company, Inc. located at 643 Brevard Road has been withdrawn.

**Agenda Items**

- (1) **Review of Level III site plan for the project identified as Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College Allied Health & Workforce Development Facility located at 240 Victoria Road. The project proposes to develop an approximately 185,421 square foot education facility. The owner is Asheville Buncombe Technical Community College and the contact is Kathryn Scott. The property is identified in the Buncombe County tax records as PINs 9648-33-4217 and portion of 9648-33-773.**

Due to a conflict of interest, Mr. Smith moved to recuse Chairman Cannady from participating in this matter. This motion was seconded by Ms. Mathews and carried on a 6-0 vote. At this time, Chairman Cannady turned the gavel over to Vice-Chairman Goldstein and left the dais.

City Clerk Magdalen Burleson administered the oath to anyone who anticipated speaking on this matter.

Urban Planner Julia Fields oriented the Commission to the site location and said that the applicant, Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College (AB Tech), is requesting conditional use approval of site plans to construct a new Allied Health and Workforce Development Facility (184,208 square feet) on their campus. As the proposed new facility has a gross floor area of more than 100,000 square feet, this project is being reviewed under the Level III review process (conditional use permit).

The project site, 13.13 acres, is located on PIN 9648.33-4217 and a portion of PIN 9648.33-7732. The small portion of the latter parcel is included so that all parking for the project will be on the same parcel and so that retaining walls will not cross property lines (building code requirement). The portion will be combined with the larger parcel to form one parcel prior to final project approval. The project site currently bears addresses of 240, 101, and 103 Victoria Road. It is the former site of the Saint Genevieve of the Pines School and has been owned and utilized as part of the AB Tech campus for a number of years. The property is zoned Institutional.

AB Tech proposes to demolish all but one (Ivy Building – auditorium/chapel) of the existing structures located on the site to allow for the construction of a building to serve as the new Allied Health and Workforce Facility for the college. The 154,530 square feet of the structure that will be completed at this time will serve as a mixed use facility housing classrooms, laboratories, offices, the campus day care center, and an 832 seat auditorium. [A portion (9,584 square feet) of the fourth floor of the structure and the entire fifth floor (20,094 square feet) of the structure will not be finished at this time. These areas will be built as a shell with only the framework, corridors to stair towers, stairs, elevators and rough ins of toilet rooms constructed at this time. When the remainder of the building is completed, additional parking or a modification will be required]. The building will be 71 feet in height; 5 stories with a small lower level on a portion of the western side of the structure (location of the child care facility). The building is being designed to be LEED certified.

Approximately 11.9 acres of the site will be graded in preparation for the construction of the facility and accompanying parking. Approximately 10.1 acres will be impervious at completion. The phasing of the project has been designed to allow the existing child care center (which is in a building slated for demolition) to continue to operate until a temporary certificate of occupancy is issued for the new building. At that time the remaining site work will be completed.

Access to the site is (and will remain) via Victoria Road where the two existing access points/drives will be improved. A traffic impact study has been completed and the recommendations of the study and the City's Traffic Engineer have been adopted in the proposed plans. Five hundred and fifty-eight parking spaces are provided on site; the minimum required by the City is 555. Pedestrian access to Victoria will be afforded in the center of the site with minimal conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Sidewalks will be provided along Victoria. A bus shelter will also be provided on Victoria.

Landscaping required for this project includes building impact landscaping, street trees, street buffer, Type A and B buffers, and vehicular use area landscaping. Fifteen percent of the site is required to be set aside for open space. The plans indicate more than the required amount of open space.

This project was reviewed and approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on October 1, 2012. Many of the comments made in the TRC report have been or are being addressed by the development team working closely with City staff. To date, staff has received no public comment on this project.

1. **That the proposed use or development of the land will not materially endanger the public health or safety.**  
The project will meet all requirements of the North Carolina Building Code and the City of Asheville and will be reviewed in detail by the North Carolina Department of Insurance and the City of Asheville's TRC to ensure compliance with safety requirements.
2. **That the proposed use or development of the land is reasonably compatible with significant natural or topographic features on the site and within the immediate vicinity of the site given the proposed site design and any mitigation techniques or measures proposed by the applicant.**  
As most of the site is already developed with buildings and parking facilities and the site is in an area heavily developed with institutional uses, there are few significant natural features on the site or in the area to be protected. Most of the pine trees that line Victoria Road will be lost due to the development; however, the planting plans propose that a number of pines will be newly planted in respect for the history of the site.
3. **That the proposed use or development of the land will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**  
The parcels in the area surrounding the site are largely occupied by other institutional uses and the site itself has been used for years for educational purposes. Where the project site abuts multi-family or single-family properties, landscape buffering will be provided. The new Allied Health and Workforce Development Facility is expected to be a complimentary use and should not injure the value of adjoining or abutting properties.
4. **That the proposed use or development of the land will be in harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density, and character of the area or neighborhood in which it is located.**  
The Allied Health and Workforce Development Facility is proposed to be five stories in height. While this is larger than the educational buildings currently located on the site it is in keeping with other institutional buildings in the vicinity. Significant vegetation will be provided on the site and open space exceeds that required by the City. The development is compatible with the scale, bulk, coverage and character of the other institutional uses in the area.
5. **That the proposed use or development of the land will generally conform to the comprehensive plan, smart growth policies, sustainable economic development strategic plan and other official plans adopted by the City.**  
  
This project supports the comprehensive plan stated goal of "the City working with Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College to address the needs of the college as it expands". Additionally, the project is proposed to be LEED certified which aligns with greenbuilding and smart growth focuses found in both the comprehensive plan and the City Council's Strategic Operating Plan.
6. **That the proposed use is appropriately located with respect to transportation facilities, water supply, fire and police protection, waste disposal, and similar facilities.**  
The proposed project is located on a roadway that serves major institutional uses at present and is served by the S4 transit route. The project has been reviewed by the Technical Review Committee who found that existing infrastructure appears to be adequate and the preliminary review has not revealed any problems for future service to the development.
7. **That the proposed use will not cause undue traffic congestion or create a traffic hazard.**

The development plans for this project along with the accompanying traffic impact analysis have been reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer. Several suggested revisions to the originally submitted plans have been made to improve both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, staff finds this request to be reasonable.

Pros:

- ? The proposal satisfies an important City goal found in the comprehensive plan of advancing and maintaining the City's role as Western North Carolina's regional education center.
- ? The applicant will be seeking LEED certification, meeting key "green building" goals of the City.
- ? The project will provide a much needed state of the art facility for the Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College on property currently underutilized by the college.
- ? The historic chapel/auditorium located on the site will be preserved.

Con:

- ? The building is significantly larger than the existing buildings on the site which may be seen as a negative by some adjoining residents.

Staff recommends approval of the Level III development proposal for the Allied Health and Workforce Development Facility for AB Tech and issuance of a conditional use permit for this facility.

When Mr. Minicozzi asked if there was a campus architectural design guideline, Mr. Joe Bace, Executive Director of Facilities and Operations, said they are looking for this project to take them on some paths towards some design standards but until they are further along, they don't want to commit to anything.

Mr. Scott Donald, representing the owner, explained to Ms. Shriner how the traffic will be mitigated. They compared schedules with Asheville High School and believe most of the people at the new facility will be there before 8:00 a.m. He also explained how most people will get off Victoria Road before they get to the Asheville High entrance. The main entrance is being corrected with this design.

In response to Ms. Mathews, Mr. John Keene, Civil Engineer, said that the heights of the three retaining walls are all less than 9 feet.

When Ms. Mathews confirmed LEED certification, Mr. Bace said they are seeking LEED certification. Mr. Donald said they believed they would be seeking Silver LEED certification.

Using picture boards, Mr. Donald explained how they are trying to blend their buildings with Mission Hospitals facilities, noting the skyline will change on the south side of Asheville.

Upon inquiry of Mr. Minicozzi, Mr. Donald explained why they cited the building in front of the church instead of behind it being more close to the street.

In response to Ms. Mathews, Mr. Donald explained the parking and how there are more opportunities to have additional parking in the future.

At Ms. Mathews request, Mr. Keene described how there will be underground stormwater management.

When Ms. Carter inquired about a master plan for the campus, Mr. Bace said that the N.C. Community College System updates their Master Plan for the campus every five years and that update would be next year.

After a brief discussion, initiated by Mr. Minicozzi, about the height of the building impacting the neighborhood (mainly Livingston Street Apartments), Mr. Bace said that they did have a public meeting. He said they did meet with Mr. Gene Bell, Executive Director of the Housing Authority; however, they mainly discussed stormwater issues and not the size of the building.

At Mr. Smith's request, Mr. Donald explained that the fourth floor is shell space (no programming, but anticipates it being future classrooms) and the fifth floor is also shell space with no programming (perhaps a single classroom).

Vice-Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:40 p.m. and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 5:40 p.m.

After concern was expressed by the Commissioners about making additional contact with the neighborhood, Mr. Bace said that AB Tech wants to be a good neighbor and committed to meeting again with the community, with staff facilitation and images to show exactly that would be seen from the neighborhood (including lighting at night), prior to this project being heard before City Council. Ms. Mathews suggested the developer ask for Mr. Bell's assistance to reach out to the apartment complex and perhaps contacting some churches in the area to promote the meeting.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, Ms. Shriner moved to recommend approval of the Level III development proposal for the Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College Allied Health & Workforce Development Facility located at 240 Victoria Road to develop an approximately 185,421 square foot education facility, subject to the conditions recommended by City staff and subject to following conditions: (1) The project shall comply with all conditions outlined in the TRC staff report; (2) This project will undergo final review by the TRC prior to the issuance of any site development permits; (3) All site lighting must comply with the City's Lighting Ordinance, Section 7-11-10, of the Unified Development Ordinance. A detailed lighting plan illustrating compliance with the ordinance will be required upon submittal of detailed plans to be reviewed by the Technical Review Committee; (4) All existing vegetation that is to be preserved must be clearly indicated and dimensioned on the site, landscape and grading plans; and (5) The building design, construction materials and orientation on site must comply with the conceptual site plan and building elevations presented with this application. Any deviation from these plans may result in reconsideration of the project by the reviewing boards. This motion was seconded by Ms. Mathews and carried unanimously by a 6-0 vote (with Chairman Cannady being recused).

At this time, Chairman Cannady returned to the dais and chaired the remainder of the meeting.

- (2) **A request for a Conditional Zoning from Highway Business District to RM-16 Residential Multi-Family High Density District/Conditional Zoning with an extension of the Manufactured Housing Community Overlay district for the project identified as Wellington Estates located at 42 Airport Road. The rezoning would allow the expansion of an existing manufactured home park and includes modifications to lot size, lot width, setbacks, street standards, sidewalks, streetlights and open space. The owner is Wellington Estates, LLC and Wellington Estates South, LLC and the contact is Lisa Stephens. The property is identified in the Buncombe County tax records as a portion of PIN 9654-00-7733.**

Urban Planner Jessica Bernstein oriented the Commission to the site location and said the applicant is requesting a Conditional Zoning for a portion of a parcel located at 42 Airport Road from HB (Highway Business District) to RM-16 (Residential Multi-Family High Density District) with an extension of the Manufactured Housing Community Overlay and approval of the development site plan in accordance with Sections 7-7-8, 7-5-7 and 7-9-5 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The site consists of a 13.65 portion of a 61 acre parcel located at 42 Airport Road. The entire parcel is currently split zoned with the subject area zoned HB while the portion adjacent to the west is RM-16. Lots are zoned Commercial Industrial to the south and north as well as Industrial to the north.

This parcel was part of a larger area annexed into the City effective March 31, 2009. At the time of annexation and initial zoning, the parcel was partially developed with a manufactured home community similar to the existing conditions as shown on submitted plans. At the request of the owner, the lot was split zoned with RM-16 and the Manufactured Home Community Overlay on the western two-thirds with Highway Business designated on the section closest to Airport Road with the intent for commercial development on this front end, rather than a continuation of the residential use.

All 13.65 acres included in the petition have previously been used as a manufactured housing community and there are 29 manufactured homes existing on the rear 5.9 acres of the subject area. The applicant is proposing to create 49 new home sites on the front portion (7.75 acres) of the subject area, for a total of 78 residences. This results in just under the allowed maximum residential density for the overlay.

Wellington Drive, Barclay Drive, White Rock Drive and Avalon Drive are existing privately-maintained roads and all three provide connections to the rear of the site and existing manufactured housing community. Two parking spaces are provided at the driveway for each unit and 10 visitor spaces are required to serve the community. Additionally, a four-foot wide sidewalk is required around and within the development (*see modification section for sidewalk*).

Street trees are required for this expansion as well as ten percent of the project area (1.365 acres) required to be set aside for open space (*see modification section for open space*).

The application is requesting the following standards to be modified, based on existing conditions and constraints and a desire to re-establish the previous development pattern for the site.

1. **Lot width** – 50' of width is required for all lots; *12 lots have less than 50' of width*
2. **Lot size** – a minimum of 5,000 square feet is required; *24 lots have less than 5,000 SF*
3. **Front setback** – a 20' front setback is required; *44 lots have less than 20' front setback*
4. **Property line setback** – units are required to be at least 35' from property lines; *25 lots border the property line*
5. **Street and ROW width** – a 30' ROW and 20' of pavement is required; Avalon, Barclay and White Rock Drives have less than the required standard and no designated ROWs; *no ROW intended and narrow roadways are existing*
6. **Sidewalks** – both internal and along Airport Road; *sidewalk will be added along Airport Road but none is proposed internally since the rest of the community does not have sidewalks and there are narrow streets with no ROWs*
7. **Streetlights** – streetlights are required; *less than the required number of streetlights are provided in this existing roadway network*
8. **Open space** – 10 percent of the project area (1.37 acres) is required to be designated as open space; *insufficient open space is proposed within the project area, the UDO provides for a fee-in-lieu option in this situation.*

This proposal was approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on October 1, 2012. No opposition or communication has been received as of the writing of this report.

Section 7-7-8(d)(2) of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) states that planning staff shall evaluate conditional zoning applications on the basis of the criteria for conditional use permits set out in Section 7-16-2. Reviewing boards may consider these criteria; however, they are not bound to act based on whether a request meets all seven standards.

- 1. That the proposed use or development of the land will not materially endanger the public health or safety.**

The proposed project has been reviewed by City staff and appears to meet all public health and safety related requirements. The project must meet the technical standards set forth in the *UDO*, the *Standards and Specifications Manual*, the *North Carolina Building Code* and other applicable laws and standards that protect the public health and safety.
- 2. That the proposed use or development of the land is reasonably compatible with significant natural or topographic features on the site and within the immediate vicinity of the site given the proposed site design and any mitigation techniques or measures proposed by the applicant.**

Due to the previous use of this site as a manufactured housing community and the existing infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, driveways and concrete pads) the proposed re-establishment is compatible with the features and similar adjacent use.
- 3. That the proposed use or development of the land will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property.**

The re-establishment of a manufactured housing community on the subject area is a continuation of the adjacent, existing use and is not expected to injure the value of adjoining or abutting properties. This use has been in place on the adjacent site for decades.
- 4. That the proposed use or development of the land will be in harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density, and character of the area or neighborhood in which it is located.**

As a continuation of the existing adjoining manufactured housing community, the proposed use and development is an extension of the character, density, coverage and scale of the neighborhood. However, there are new standards in place for manufactured housing communities since the original establishment of this location, not all of which are in compliance. This does not necessarily create an inharmonious situation.
- 5. That the proposed use or development of the land will generally conform to the comprehensive plan, smart growth policies, sustainable economic development strategic plan and other official plans adopted by the City.**

The proposed re-establishment of the manufactured home community generally conforms to goals of the City as detailed in the compliance sections of this report. Specifically, the development provides lower-cost residential options and supports and enhances multimodal transportation usage.

Requested modifications to the internal sidewalk and open space are contrary to stated goals of the Manufactured Housing Community Overlay District (Section 7-9-5) promoting the "health, safety and welfare of area residents through the provision of standards for infrastructure and open space." However, existing infrastructure creates site constraints and challenges to compliance.

**6. That the proposed use is appropriately located with respect to transportation facilities, water supply, fire and police protection, waste disposal, and similar facilities.**

This site is located on Airport Road, less than a mile from Hendersonville Road, which places the project in an easily accessible location by car and Asheville transit (S3). The project has been reviewed by the Technical Review Committee and this previously developed site has existing infrastructure in place.

**7. That the proposed use will not cause undue traffic congestion or create a traffic hazard.**

The City Traffic Engineer has stated that the existing traffic conditions have stabilized and will not be substantially changed by this project.

Pro:

- ? Provides lower-cost residential options in an area with existing infrastructure.

Con:

- ? Due to the existing infrastructure layout (utilities, roads), compliance with current standards cannot be met in many instances, resulting in a number of modification requests that are contrary to the goals of the Manufactured Housing Community Overlay District – most notably internal sidewalks and open space.

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning, the extension of the overlay and the site plan, re-establishing the manufactured housing community on this portion of the parent parcel. Staff notes that the layout of this community was put in place prior to the current standards, justifying the difficulty with compliance and the need for the multiple modifications. Staff recommends the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu for deficient open space.

In response to Vice-Chairman Goldstein, Ms. Bernstein explained how the fee-in-lieu of amount for open space was derived. The fee-in-lieu of amount is approximately \$50,000 (only on the part that is being re-established). City Council can either grant the modification, the applicant can designate a part of the land to meet the open space requirements, or pay the fee-in-lieu, which is an option spelled out in the Unified Development Ordinance for open space. Ms. Tuch further explained that the developer vacated the use years ago and then recently decided to re-establish the use. Staff must treat this like any other new use. Ms. Tuch also mentioned that any fees collected for fee-in-lieu open space are put into a fund for park and greenway improvements for that general part of the City.

In response to Ms. Carter, Ms. Tuch said that the 2025 Plan was adopted in 2002 and the property was annexed in 2009.

With not being able to see a plan for that corridor, Ms. Carter was concerned that this might not be consistent with the corridor long-term. Not wanting to speak for the developer, Ms. Tuch felt that the developer saw the direction of the corridor and that was the reason why the homes were vacated off that front portion to begin with but then the market changed. Planning & Development Director Judy Daniel said that staff is looking at moving toward mixed use on our commercial corridors.

Ms. Mathews said that there are a lot of retail businesses close by and even though multi-family residential might not be ideal for the corridor development, she was comfortable with conditionally zoning the property, at least until there are other solutions for affordable housing.

In response to Mr. Minicozzi about what an adequate buffer would be on a road that is so busy, Ms. Bernstein said that there is only a small piece of lot up against Airport Road and the Manufacturing Housing Overlay would require 35 feet from the property line.



Mr. Chris Day, representing the developer, said that this is an existing manufactured housing community, noting every lot has a pad, meter, sewer taps, etc. The developer will be adding some supplemental street trees as well as constructing a sidewalk along Airport Road. He will also bring in a new water main and fire hydrant to better provide fire protection service for the community. He understands staff's position on open space and if this was a new manufactured housing community the open space would be laid out at the beginning. However, we have existing infrastructure in place. They looked at removing a couple of lots, but that would not allow them to meet the full intent of the open space requirements. They are still short approximately .7 acres of open space.

When Ms. Mathews noted that there is a mobile home that straddles two lots, Mr. Day said that the two lots are powered separately. Mr. Morosani said that the home will be rotated to be just on one lot. If the other lot stays empty, he could get open space credit for that space.

Mr. George Morosani, developer, gave a brief history of the project, noting the existing large pine trees are a good buffer. He is asking to create 49 new home sites on the front portion in addition to the existing 352 homes on the entire 61 acre parcel. He said four years ago when he asked that the property be rezoned he was thinking of putting a shadow store to the Super Wal-Mart, but he felt more affordable housing was needed. Wellington Estates is a clean and well-maintained park made up of people who have pride of ownership. He is spending \$38,000 for the sidewalk along Airport Road and other improvements and would prefer not to pay the \$50,000 fee-in-lieu of for the open space, but would pay it in order to move the project forward.

In response to Chairman Cannady, Mr. Morosani said they are adding an additional fire hydrant to service the community. He said he was probably the 8<sup>th</sup> largest water user in the City of Asheville.

Ms. Mathews supported the fee-in-lieu of payment noting that the since the money will go into parks or greenways in that area, it would be beneficial to the 400 families in Wellington Estates.

Mr. Smith understood it was Council's decision to waive the open space standards, but personally he did not support the \$50,000 fee-in-lieu of in this economy since this is an old existing project.

Chairman Cannady opened the public hearing at 6:26 p.m. and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 6:26 p.m.

For clarification purposes, Ms. Tuch said that either Mr. Morosani has to provide the open space or pay the fee-in-lieu of. The request is to waive the open space requirement, which means no open space provided and no fee paid.

Vice-Chairman Goldstein said that since this is a unique situation and it provides important affordable housing, personally he felt the developer should not get rid of any usable lot and that the developer not be required to pay the fee-in-lieu of.

Chairman Cannady agreed with Vice-Chairman Goldstein and Mr. Smith in that it is an existing mobile home park. However, if the open space is waived, we could be setting a precedent.

Ms. Shriner noted that in other projects there are fee-in-lieu of payments where sidewalks are not able to be built on the property, so this type of payment is not anything new.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, Ms. Mathews moved to recommend approval of the conditional zoning request from Highway Business District to RM-

16 Residential Multi-Family High Density District/Conditional Zoning with an extension of the Manufactured Housing Community Overlay district for the project identified as Wellington Estates located at 42 Airport Road including approval of the proposed Site Plan and Extension of the Manufactured Housing Community Overlay, and approval of the modification requests to lot size, lot width, setbacks, street standards, sidewalks, streetlights and open space, subject to the following conditions: (1) The project shall comply with all conditions outlined in the TRC staff report; (2) This project will undergo final review by the TRC prior to the issuance of any site development permits; (3) All site lighting must comply with the City's Lighting Ordinance, Section 7-11-10, of the Unified Development Ordinance. A detailed lighting plan illustrating compliance with the ordinance will be required upon submittal of detailed plans to be reviewed by the Technical Review Committee; (4) All existing vegetation that is to be preserved must be clearly indicated and dimensioned on the site, landscape and grading plans; (5) The building design, construction materials and orientation on site must comply with the conceptual site plan and building elevations presented with this application. Any deviation from these plans may result in reconsideration of the project by the reviewing boards; (6) Easement for a bus shelter is required and must be received and recorded prior to final zoning approval; and (7) Fee in lieu for open space must be received prior to final zoning approval. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

### **Other Business**

When Ms. Carter and Ms. Mathews suggested a review of bike rack requirements, Ms. Tuch asked that Ms. Mathews forward the bike rack design standards to staff.

When Mr. Minicozzi inquired about the zoning issues/neighborhood planning for the Kenilworth area, Ms. Daniel said that a neighborhood association representative came to a City Council meeting and asked for a zoning analysis for the Caledonia and Finalee area. City Council directed Planning staff for that zoning analysis and staff will present their report to Council on December 11.

Chairman Cannady announced the next meeting on December 5, 2012, at 5:00 p.m. in the First Floor Conference Room in the City Hall Building.

### **Adjournment**

At 6:37 p.m., Vice-Chairman Goldstein moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Smith and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.